

**Answers to Questions on Solicitation GSV07PD0007**

Q.1.1 Reference: Section L.7.3, P-196 – Business Proposal Submission Requirements – Second bullet – A list of company officials by name and title who are authorized to negotiate and financially and legally commit the offeror – If a contractor does not wish to change its Business Proposal or Technical Proposal but did not include said list of company officials in its original Business Proposal, is it required to resubmit its entire Business Proposal to add said list? If so, is it also required to resubmit its entire Technical Proposal? Alternatively, is it sufficient for a contractor to provide said list of company officials in its letter to the Contracting Officer certifying the validity of the originally submitted proposal (thus, no resubmission of either the Business Proposal or Technical Proposal)?

**A.1.1 Offerors can satisfy this requirement by attaching the list of company officials to their letter stipulating that their proposal, in response to solicitation GSV07PD0003, represents their proposal in response to solicitation GSV07PD0007. The letter should also stipulate that the proposal will remain in effect for 270 days from 08/06/2007.**

Q.2.1 The solicitation states on page 195, section L.7.3 Business Proposal Submission Requirements, lines 7594 and 7595: *"a list of company officials by name and title who are authorized to negotiate and financially and legally commit the offeror;"*

1. Should vendor decide not to resubmit a complete response, as is outlined on page 185, section L7 General Instructions for Preparation of Proposal, lines 7096 to 7102; may we provide the required signatory authority personnel listing, as requested in lines 7594 and 7595, in our acknowledgement letter?

The solicitation states on page 185, section L.7 General Instructions for Preparation of Proposal, lines 7099 to 7103 *"They do, however, need to submit a letter on company letterhead, signed by an individual who was authorized to submit the proposal in response to the original solicitation, stipulating that the entire proposal submitted in response to the original solicitation, represents their entire proposal in response to the revised solicitation, and that this proposals remains in full force and effect."*

2. Should vendor decide to submit only the letter as instructed in lines 7099 to 7103, is there also a requirement to sign a new SF33 and provide this document with the letter?

**A.2.1.1 See answer to question 1.1**

**A.2.1.2 The Standard Form 33 from the proposal in response to solicitation GSV07PD0003 is all that is required.**

Q.3.1 Under Section L.7.3.1.1 Pricing Structure, the Government states, "Note: failure on the part of an offeror to provide a unit price for each and every Contract Line Item

Number (CLIN), in each and every contract period will render that offeror's price proposal "non-responsive." In the development of our pricing there are specific CLINs under Service Initiation/Change Order Charges that do not require additional initiation cost. For these CLINs is it the recommendation of the Government that we leave these at a Zero (\$0.0) value or include an acronym such as "NSP" to indicate these items are "Not Separately Priced".

**A.3.1 The Government will apply a value of \$0.0 to any CLINs that are labeled as "Not Separately Priced". Offerors are reminded to provide prices for all CLINs for all contract periods, including Base Period, Option Periods, and Extended Periods.**

Q.3.2 Section L.7.3 Business Proposal Submission Requirements requires "a Cover letter on company letterhead stipulating that the proposal shall remain in effect for two hundred seventy (270) days;" and also requires "a list of company officials by name and title who are authorized to negotiate and financially and legally commit the offeror;" For those companies satisfied with their already submitted proposal can these two items be combined in the updated Business Proposal "Cover Letter" without having to submit a new Business Proposal?

**A.3.2 See answer to question 1.1**

Q.3.3 Section B, Schedule of Supplies or Services, Table B.2.1.2-5 is entitled "Incremental Base Facility & Equipment – Over 250 Equivalent Workstations". Was it the Government's intent to include the word "Base" within the title of Table B.2.1.2-5? If so is it the Government's intent that we resubmit our already submitted proposal to reflect this change? The prior tables under B.2.1.2-X do not include the word "Base" within the table title.

**A.3.3 The word "Base" should not be included in the title of Table B.2.1.2-5. The solicitation is being amended to reflect this change.**

Q.4.1 In the synopsis for the subject solicitation, it states:

"To be considered for an award under this solicitation, the offeror must have gained the following minimum experience qualifications during the five (5) years immediately prior to the date of the Government's receipt of proposals for this solicitation: (i) at least two (2) years' general experience in providing information and referral services with annual work volumes handled by agents of no less than 1,000,000 telephone inquiries and 75,000 e-mail inquiries; (ii) at least one (1) year of specialized experience in providing information services in a multi-media environment, including the use of telephone, facsimile, e-mail, and web-based media; (iii) at least two (2) years experience in providing information services in a multi-language environment; and (iv) at least two (2) years of specialized experience in handling case management in an information and referral service environment."

However, in the current solicitation (GSV07PD0007) it includes the Questions and Answers from the previous solicitation (GSV07PD0003) and they read like so:

**“A.4.8 See response to A.1.10.**

Q.4.9 Reference: Section L.7.2.1.3.1, P-155 - Minimum Experience Qualifications Criteria; Section J, Attachment 1, P-123 - Past Performance Survey Questionnaire - The RFP sections cited above specify four minimum qualifications an offeror must have gained during the past 5 years to be considered for award of the USA Contact contract, and direct the offeror to communicate the requirements to its past performance references. Will the Government clarify whether (1) the criteria can be met by *aggregating* the minimums across more than one program—e.g., a total of “no less than 100,000 telephone inquiries and 7,500 e-mail inquiries” is handled each month across the three different contact centers cited by the offeror—or (2) all four criteria must be met in each individual contact center program cited by the offeror.

A.4.9 Offerors do not need to meet all four minimum experience qualification requirements specified in Section L.7.2.1.3.1 for each of the projects selected. If the selected projects are supported by more than one center, then the work volumes handled at each of the centers supporting the project can be aggregated to meet the minimum experience requirements. However, work volumes of different projects cannot be aggregated to meet the minimum experience requirements.

Q.2 Why can a bidder not aggregate work volumes across “projects”? The term “project” is not well-defined in the solicitation. Will the Government reconsider this Q/A response to allow aggregation of telephone contacts? There do not appear to be any requirements in the solicitation (sections C or L) that address aggregation of work volumes of calls.

A.2 The answer to Question 4.9 on page 14 of 33 in the questions and answers (part of Amendment A001) will not be changed. The Government needs the ability to assess a contractor’s capacity to process 100,000 telephone inquiries per month that are related to a particular project, accountable to a particular agency or activity.

It is not essential that all of these calls be processed at a single call center, but is essential that a single, unified management team, dedicated to that particular project, be accountable to the ordering agency or activity.”

Do the directions in the synopsis override the Questions/Answers that were from the “old” solicitation (GSV07PD0003)? We are somewhat confused because it would appear that the synopsis should be the determining factor, but we need to know if the answers provided for the questions from the previous solicitation are still limiting criteria for the

current solicitation. Since there does appear to be a discrepancy, could you please clarify this issue?

**A.4.1 The minimum qualifications requirements stated in the synopsis for the subject solicitation mirrors the requirements stated in Section L.7.2.1.3.1 of Solicitation GSV07PD0007, which superseded the requirements of Section L.7.2.1.3.1 of solicitation GSV07PD0003. The Questions/Answers issued as amendment to GSV07PD0003, which were included as a historical reference to the evolution of this solicitation, clarified the Government's interpretation of the requirements to mean that offerors do not need to meet all four minimum experience qualification requirements specified in Section L.7.2.1.3.1 for each of the projects selected. Offerors must meet the specific minimum experience qualifications requirements stated in Section L.2.1.3.1 of Solicitation GSV07PD0007. Also see response to Q.6.2.**

Q.4.2 Will the Government grant an extension on the delivery date of this procurement until August 20, 2007.

**A.4.2 No. The 11:00 am EDT, August 6, 2007 due date for proposals will remain unchanged.**

Q.5.1 If a past performance reference questionnaire was submitted in respect to the predecessor solicitation, is it necessary to have the questionnaire resubmitted?

**A.5.1 No.**

Q.6.1 Reference: Section H.3, P-101 – Overall Contract Maximum Amount - The GSA solicitation number listed in this section is GSV07PD0003, which is the original solicitation number. Will the Government amend this section in order to list the new solicitation number (GSV07PD0007)?

**A.6.1 The solicitation is being amended to reflect the correct solicitation number.**

Q.6.2 Reference: Section J, Attachment 4, Answers to Questions on Solicitation GSV07PD0003, Q.4.9 and A.4.9, Section L.7.2.1.3.1, Minimum Experience Qualifications Criteria - Do the requirements in the current solicitation (GSV07PD0007) supersede all conflicting instructions provided in Attachment 4 – *Answers to Questions on Solicitation GSV07PD0003*?

For example, in Attachment 4 – *Answers to Questions on Solicitation GSV07PD0003*, A.4.9, the Government states the following:

*“Offerors do not need to meet all four minimum experience qualification requirements specified in Section L.7.2.1.3.1 for each of the projects selected. If the selected projects are supported by more than one center, then the work volumes handled at each of the centers supporting the project can be aggregated*

*to meet the minimum experience requirements. However, work volumes of different projects cannot be aggregated to meet the minimum experience requirements."*

This response requires the Offeror to demonstrate the following experience (from the updated requirements in RFP Section L.7.2.1.3.1, *Minimum Experience Qualifications Criteria*) within a single contract:

*"at least two (2) years' general experience in providing information and referral services with annual work volumes handled by agents of no less than 1,000,000 telephone inquiries and 75,000 e-mail inquiries"*

Is it correct to assume that the new solicitation (GSV07PD0007) allows for work volumes of different projects to be aggregated to meet the minimum experience requirements?

**A.6.2 No.** The answer to the question raised on Section L.7.2.1.3.1 of Solicitation GSV07PD0003 also applies to Section L.7.2.1.3.1 of Solicitation GSV07PD0007. This means that offerors do not need to meet all four minimum experience qualification requirements specified in Section L.7.2.1.3.1 for each of the projects selected. If the selected projects are supported by more than one center, then the work volumes handled at each of the centers supporting the project can be aggregated to meet the minimum experience requirements. However, work volumes of different projects cannot be aggregated to meet the minimum experience requirements. Also see response to Q.4.1.

**Q.6.3** Section L.7, P-186 – General Instructions for Preparation of Proposal - According to this section, the following is required in updating an Offeror's proposal:

*"Offerors who provided a proposal under the original solicitation and who are providing a new proposal under the revised solicitation is requested to identify all changes with a vertical line in the right hand margin of the page."*

If the Offeror's original proposal listed the original solicitation number (GSV07PD0003) in the header and/or footer of each page of the proposal, does the Government require change bars for the changed solicitation number (now GSV07PD0007) on each page of the document where reference is made to the previous solicitation number?

**A.6.3 No.**

**Q.6.4** Reference: Section L.7.1, P-187 – Submission of Proposals - This requirement states the following:

*"After the initial proposals, each revision, if the determination has been not been made to award on the basis of initial proposal(s) only, shall also include the revision number, e.g., Revision 01, Revision 02, etc."*

Since the original solicitation (GSV07PD0003) was cancelled and this solicitation (GSV07PD0007) is a new solicitation, does the Government require Offerors to label the revised submittal (in response to solicitation number GSV07PD0007) as "Revision 01"?

**A.6.4 No.**